

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out that which Applicant regards as the invention therein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cloutier et al. (US Pat. 5,847,771) in view of Washino et al. (US Pat. 5,625,410).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Neither Cloutier nor Washino, taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations of the above amended claims. Cloutier discloses to receive programs over an ATM system in which the AV data is broadcasts from a provider in multiplexed in packetized form. Col. 4: 64 through col. 6: 2; col. 7: 4-10; col. 45-64. Cloutier proposes to provide PIP in an ATM system by decoding the received ATM AV data of two received programs (e.g. to avoid the need for dual decoders), by first demultiplexing them, decoding a primary program, and partially decoding a secondary program. See, Fig. 5, col. 9: 48-65; col. 11: 55 through col. 12: 34. Cloutier discloses to output the decoded PIP to a television by outputting to “television set 54 the primary and secondary images as a video signal representing a frame of the primary video data having a portion overlaid by the decompressed secondary video data.” See, Fig. 8, col. 12: 35-42.

Cloutier does not transmit a non-composited digital transport stream as augmented to a display device, as set forth in Applicant's amended claims. The stream which Cloutier transmits to the display is not a "non-composited" stream, which is defined in Applicant's disclosure as:

As used herein, the term "non-composited" means that given digital transport stream comprises a plurality of separate AV streams that are multiplexed, rather than a single video stream that contains a single video image formed by layering multiple video images and a single audio stream that contains a single audio track formed by mixing multiple audio tracks.

See, ¶ 21. Rather, Cloutier provides a single stream formed by layering multiple video images. See, Fig. 8, col. 12: 35-42. Cloutier also does not include control information in the stream provided to the display device.

Washino merely discloses a PC based video monitoring and conferencing system. Washino discloses to simultaneously receive and display images from several video cameras by "data compressing" the images, and combining them in a video image (e.g. frame) via a graphics processor to be provided to a microprocessor to be displayed as a combined feed. See, Fig. 7; col. 6: 48 through col. 7: 11 ("[T]he data-compressed images are provided in digital form to the microprocessor data bus 12"). Washino explains that the microprocessor may provide a control signal the graphics processor "in accordance with the image data allocation configuration selected", e.g. to select the image from a single camera on a "full screen." Washino also does not appear to transmit a non-composited digital transport stream as augmented to a display device, as set forth in Applicant's amended claims. The stream which Washino transmits to the display does not appear to be a "non-composited" stream, rather it appears to be a single video stream that contains a single video image created by graphics processor 10. The stream

transmitted to the display of Washino also does not appear to contain control information as set forth in Applicant's amended claims. The control information discussed in Washino does not appear to be associated with a transport stream provided to a display, but rather appears to pertain to controlling the selection and scaling of the images created/chosen by the graphics processor.

Accordingly, as neither Cloutier nor Washino, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations, the combination does not render the above claims as unpatentable.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependence on an allowed base claim.

CONCLUSION

No fees are due for this Amendment beyond the fees for the Petition for a three (3) Month Extension of Time. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the rejections made in the last Office Action and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. The Applicant's representative can be reached at the below telephone number if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/Larry T. Cullen/  
Larry T. Cullen  
Reg. No. 44,489  
Motorola, Inc.  
101 Tournament Drive  
Horsham, PA 19044  
P (215) 323-1797  
F (215) 323-1300

March 25, 2010  
Date